5/4/69

Dear Dick,

This morning I read the enclosure with your 4/28. I have a few suggestions, but the one I would emphasize is that you let any further finished writing wait a while, that you draft roughs and let them cool. You are too close to it.

You make out a good case, but in doing it you assume knowledge on the part of the reader even "buffs" may not have. Rectifying these will be simple. A minor example is on page 2, where many readers will not know what the "shoulder" of the case really is. At the same point, you assume the reader will know that the casings allegedly used in the murder also were dented and you do not adequately explain what CEs 544 and 545 are. This is occupational; I suffer it all the time.

After reading this I find the belief I earlier expressed more persuasive. I work two things together here. I said you should handle the dents and the taggets-trajectories together. This should begin with a dramatic statement, unless it is designed to follow something else, like "Lee Harvey Oswald was framed, no less by the FBI than by those who made it appear he murdered the President when he did not." The case of the dents is strengthened by the case of the targets-trajectories and vice versa.

On page 2, is it safe to assume that there could not have been a special characteristic of this rifle that we have found in no other? Could something of this sort have caused the dents? Also on this page, at this point, you should explain how the tremenduous pressure of the discharge removes existing dents and use John's pictures or make and use your own (can be done here).

Page three , "the accomplice". This refers to no one for you have not said there was any kind of accomplice.

Pge 4: illustrations excellent. My one question is should you use "hardened" in connection with steel?

Page 6, bottom, add, past par, "much less" of "weaker" to comparison.

Bottom page 7 or top 8, even though you later say it, emphasize something of this sort: And Frazier testified to none - his pictures show none - he actually testified there were none." Or, say it here.

Page 10: did not JFK also weep because his own murder was unsolved and this is one of the reasons - perhaps because this framing hid the meaning of, the reasons for his murder - and thus the people did not understand why he was murdered?

Even if this is to be part of other writing, with something before and something after, I think it should open with a premise rather than a qualification of Frazier as a genuine expert. It is the kind of thing that warrants the dramatic. Were it designed for a semi-technical journal, I would still believe this.

I wrote John after getting the carbon of his undated letter to you. A copy is enclosed.

What are your plans? When do you expect to come? I should lay the groundwork with the Archives and make tentative dates with the local people.